COLCHESTER PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

DECEMBER 1, 2009

PRESENT: Tom Mulcahy, Peter Larrabee, Rich Paquette

ALSO PRESENT: Sarah Hadd, Town Planner

1. Call to Order

T. Mulcahy called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

2. Review Procedural Rules

The Commission reviewed the updated procedural rules. The Commission requested that the proposed changes be provided to the Town Attorney for his review and comments.

Action deferred until December 15, 2009.

3. Review Draft Floodplain Regulations

S. Hadd provided the Commission with a synopsis of the revised draft Floodplain Regulations. She clarified that construction in the floodplain is not allowed and the only exception is for a rebuild of an existing structure in the floodplain and would most likely require a variance if there was any increase in size. Staff Notes state that the draft as proposed incorporates the standard language of the State and FEMA and leaves the purpose and intent of the Colchester Zoning Regulations intact.

Areas of concern included the fact that it appears that the document will prohibit the construction of seawalls. S. Hadd reported that she will contact the proper person at the State to obtain clarification.

A **motion** was made by P. Larrabee and **seconded** by R. Paquette to warn the draft Floodplain Regulations as S25 for a public hearing subject to clarification of the seawall issue The **motion passed** with a vote of 3 - 0.

4. Review Agricultural Mixed Use District

The Commission continued their review of the Agricultural Mixed Use District from the November 17th meeting.

S. Hadd provided the Commission with changes requested at the last meeting in the text of the District (Section 6.04) and in Table A-2 (Dimensions). These changes include creating a maximum lot size for residential lots, changes to the minimum lot size for residential, changes to lot coverage, and changes to explicitly state maximums and clustering. S. Hadd did not edit Table A-1 (Uses) as the Commission had not provided direction yet as to whether or not the uses requested in the Shadow Cross letter of November 16th should be incorporated.

The Commission reviewed the Section 6.04 Agricultural Mixed Use District (AMU).

Areas of discussion included, but were not limited, to the following:

- distribution facility and warehousing;
- storage within a fully enclosed structures remove "fully" as structures could then be a building or fencing or a wall;
- the intent of the language should be so that something less restrictive can be defined as a structure:
- 30% lot coverage too restrictive can increase later if need be;
- size of gross building footage needs to be defined;
- Transfer of Development Rights;
- concern that any change would create a change to assessment and would raise taxes;
- add landscaping facility and services as a permitted use;
- add language for review by Commission with regard to requirements for screening.

The Commission discussed the issue of tax implications as it relates to the AMU District. S. Hadd explained that the Commission is working on fixing the AMU language of the regulations at this time. A second supplement might be rezoning a specific parcel to AMU. Until such time that a specific parcel is zoned AMU there will not be any implications with regards to appraisal value of that property and tax increases.

In Summary, S. Hadd said she will revise the language based on the comments and the Commission will review it on the 15th of December. After that, the property owners will receive a copy and Staff will request that they provide specific feedback by a certain date and also inform them of a meeting date to further discuss with the Commission.

5. Packet Information

The Commission reviewed the information that they received in their packets.

6. Review Future Agenda

The Commission reviewed the upcoming agendas for December $15^{\rm th}$ and the January 2010 meetings.

7. Minutes of November 17, 2009

A **motion** was made by P. Larrabee and **seconded** by P. Loranger to approve the minutes of November 17, 2009 as amended. The **motion passed** with a vote of 3 - 0.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought before the Commission, a motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. All members of the Commission present voted in favor of the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Minutes taken and respectfully submitted by Lisa Riddle.

Approved this 15th day of December 2009		
 	Planning Commission	